



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

leg" teachers in our high schools and not a sufficient number of master-workmen.

On the one hand it seems to be the task of the schoolmen to see that salary scales are made commensurate with the quality of work done. On the other hand it is the task of the colleges to see to it that a sufficient number of the best of their classes is trained to go out into the state and teach in the high schools. It is a good investment for the colleges, for ere long they reap of their own sowings. Nor is it sufficient merely to offer certain courses and trust that in some way the good students will elect them. There must be a conscious definite effort on the part of the colleges to try to induce such students as are deemed fit to prepare themselves for the teaching profession. The quality of work that is to be done in our high schools is up to the colleges. If the college students who enter the colleges are poorly prepared, the colleges and not the high schools are to blame, for the colleges furnish and prepare (?) the high school teachers.

Since this article was prepared the following facts for the U. S. as a whole have become available. They are interesting as a basis for comparison with the North Carolina situation.

Of 13,976 high schools in cities of 10,000 or more:

Less than	1% paid.....	\$ 300 to \$ 500
Less than	1% paid.....	500 to 700
About	13% paid.....	700 to 900
About	21% paid.....	900 to 1100
About	20% paid.....	1100 to 1300
About	18% paid.....	1300 to 1500
About	19% paid.....	1500 to 1700
About	9% paid.....	1700 to 1900
Less than	1% paid.....	1900 to 2100
Less than	1% paid.....	2100 to 2300
Less than	1% paid.....	2300 to 2500
149 cities paid.....		Over 2500

The median salary paid to high school teachers in cities of 10,000 or more throughout the United States is \$1,149.50. Approximately 30% of these cities pay a larger annual salary to high school teachers than the highest salary we pay to any high school teacher here in North Carolina cities.

We are frequently asked for a list of the standard colleges of North Carolina. The tentative list of colleges for North Carolina that the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of ten Southern States regards as probably of standard grade, though some of them are not members of the Association, are the following: University of N. C., Trinity College, Davidson College, Wake Forest, North Carolina College for Women, State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Meredith, Guilford, Salem, and Elon.

ENGLISH TEACHERS' COLUMN

HOW MUCH GRAMMAR?

ONE of the best of the old things that have passed from secondary school instruction is the teaching of grammar—the grammar of highly inflected languages particularly, English grammar incidentally. I have heard a decade of complaint from college and university instructors in modern languages concerning the school boy's ignorance of English grammar, especially in the South. To judge from the undiminishing volume of this complaint the cause of it is of longer standing.

Briefly the indictment is this: grammar, which has been the concern of secondary schools in past generations, now has to be taught in the college. Three unfortunate results are the outcome of this condition: (1) the student loses a year's headway, more or less, in learning a modern language and in advancing to the upper reaches of English composition; (2) he attacks the advanced studies of college or the problems of making a living, as the case may be, without the proper development in the mental faculties of inductive and deductive reasoning and of memory, for which declensions, conjugations, and syntax afford the cheapest and readiest exercise; (3) as only five per cent of our youth go to college, ninety-five per cent enter life without adequate training in the most valuable asset the school can give them—control of their mother tongue.

From my own experience in teaching English composition I am prepared to agree with this bill of complaint. Certainly a large proportion of the time and energy I spend upon my Freshmen goes toward doctoring up their English grammar, which should have been in a sound condition before they left school. Of some seventy errors that the University of North Carolina's instructors of Freshmen are expected to eliminate annually, about half are due to ignorance of either elementary syntax or the parts of speech.

In a number of cases the error is due directly to ignorance of the functions of the parts of speech,—for instance, in the use of the adjective instead of the adverb; in the failure to distinguish between conjunction and adverb in the case of the conjunctive adverbs, between conjunction and preposition in the case of *as* and *like*; in the failure to see that initial modifying participial and gerundive phrases must have something to modify; in the capitalization of titles. In other cases the error is due to the student's not knowing the nature of the sentence and the clause; in still others, the function of the subjunctive mood. All too frequently he cannot conjugate the most common irregular verbs.

The hope of eliminating such errors rests upon the student's ultimately knowing certain simple grammatical facts. Why shouldn't he use an adjective instead of an adverb if he doesn't know the difference between the two? What's the use of telling him to set off a non-restrictive clause with commas, when he doesn't know whether a clause belongs to the vegetable or the animal kingdom? Imagine his confusion when he strikes words that have several functions. "I went for a wagon that had been mailed by parcel post from Chicago." "I went, for a wagon that contained six policemen had driven up to the door." Tell him to put a comma before *for* in the second sentence because there it is a conjunction connecting the co-ordinate clauses of a compound sentence; whereas in the first sentence it is a preposition. Tell him to hitch the wagon to a star; you might as well.

Of course it cannot be hoped that the old-fashioned school training will be revived, since Greek is dead; Latin, dying; and German, Berlitzed. Nor can it be hoped that any vigorous discipline in English grammar will be instituted. Some English grammar, however, can be taught. The question is, "How much?"

As a practical suggestion I would propose that an effort be made to teach the school boy how the parts of speech function; what constitutes a sentence, a phrase, a clause, a subject, a predicate; the distinction between the restrictive and the non-restrictive relationship, between volition and futurity in determining the use of *shall* and *will*, between the simple condition and the condition contrary to fact in determining the use of the subjunctive mood; and the conjugation of the irregular verbs. That much would help a lot. It might even go a little way toward surrounding English grammar with something more than an archaeological interest.

School teachers can do only their best. Theirs is a full day. But perhaps some reorganization of the day's work might make room for the teaching of more grammar, with an attendant reduction in the numbers of the grammatically defective. The fate of such defectives is undeserved. Those who go to college are handicapped in their work and add to the teaching load of the college a burden it is not designed to bear. These, however, are only a small per cent of the total; and they will be patched up. But how about the vast remainder of these defectives—they who enter at once the struggle of life, to fail or to succeed? In many callings they cannot achieve the full measure of success; in any calling they cannot exploit to the full the success they achieve.—J. M. Booker.

If you like the JOURNAL, tell your neighbor.

THE LATIN COLUMN

TEACHERS OF LATIN WILL PLEASE NOTE

A RECENT editorial article in the *Nation* makes better teaching the prime need for popularizing Latin. The article reads:

A single day brings the double announcement that Princeton will no longer require Greek for entrance and will require Latin only of candidates for the Bachelor of Arts degree, and that Yale will not demand Latin either for admission to the college or for graduation from it. That these two ultra-conservative seats of "liberal" culture should thus let down the bars will be a grievous blow to many of the adherents of classical education in this country. Yet we doubt whether the true friends of the classics have real cause for grief in such action. The study of Greek and Latin in the United States has suffered from its privileged position in secondary and college curricula; classical teachers have been able to rely on tradition and compulsion rather than on the inherent excellence of their work to hold students. The keen competition to which the classics are being subjected will result, we believe, in a study of educational values and an improvement in methods of classical teaching that will in the end redound to the advantage of truly liberal study. No informed person will question the extraordinary value for educational purposes of the study of Greek life and its literary expression. Once the classicists are content to rest their case on the excellence of what they have to offer, they may be well assured of a permanent place in our educational scheme.—*The Nation*.

"PURPOSE" AND "RESULT" CLAUSES

Some idiomatic constructions contrasting purpose and result clauses:

Purpose	Result
"That nobody"ne quis.ut nemo	
"That nothing"ne quid.ut nihil	
"That no"ne ullus.ut nullus	
"That never"ne umquam.ut numquam	
"Or (and) no one"ne quis.nec quisquam	
"Or no"ne ullus.nec ullus	

In affirmative sentences the Latin makes little or no distinction between Purpose and Result, both taking the subjunctive. English, however, translates Purpose by "may" and "might," and puts Results in the Indicative. The difference in Latin is only inferential.—G. K. G. H.

"CUM" CLAUSES

LATIN students are often confused in classifying *cum* clauses. A simple rule may be stated thus:
cum translated "since," causal, takes the subjunctive.
cum translated "although," concessive, takes the subjunctive.
cum translated "when," circumstantial, takes the subjunctive.